IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 369 OF 2006.

Shri Ravindra Barku Khare. ... Petitioner.

V/s.

The Chembur Nagrik Sahakari Bank Ltd. ... Respondent.

N.M.Ganguli for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

CORAM: V.C.DAGA, J.

DATED: 20th February 2006.

P.C.:

. Heard Mr.Ganguli, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Mr.Ganguli contends that the question involved in the petition is: "can there be a fixed term appointment of a workman?" in absence of any provision in the standing orders. This question has not been raised before either of the authorities below. The contention raised is devoid of any substance. If the employer has right to appoint a workman and, terminate his services; subject to compliance of law for the time being in force, I fail to understand, why there cannot be a composite inbuilt order

indicating the date of his termination in the order of appointment itself. The workman gets a notice in advance that, his services shall come to an end in future on a specified date. The contention raised, therefore, has no merit.

3. Even otherwise, the view taken in the impugned reasoned order is possible and reasonable view in facts and circumstances of the case in hand.

4. In the above view of the matter, the petition is without any substance. The same is dismissed in limine with no order as to costs.

(V.C.DAGA, J.)